

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To:
GREGORY N. CLEMENTS
DOUGHERTY CLEMENTS, HOFER & BERNARD
1901 ROXBOROUGH ROAD, SUITE 300
CHARLOTTE, NC 28211

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

		Date of Mailing (day/month/year) <i>12-2-04</i>
Applicant's or agent's file reference 2003-13-PCT		REPLY DUE within 2 months/days from the above date of mailing <i>due 2-5-05</i>
International application No. PCT/US03/40872	International filing date (day/month/year) 22 December 2003 (22.12.2003)	Priority date (day/month/year) 23 December 2002 (23.12.2002)
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC(7): C08J 5/06 and US Cl.: 156/335, 910; 152/565; 428/296.4		
Applicant INVISTA TECHNOLOGIES S.A RL.		

<p>1. This written opinion is the <u>first</u> (first, etc.) drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.</p> <p>2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Basis of the opinion II <input type="checkbox"/> Priority III <input type="checkbox"/> Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability IV <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of unity of invention V <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2 (a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement VI <input type="checkbox"/> Certain documents cited VII <input type="checkbox"/> Certain defects in the international application VIII <input type="checkbox"/> Certain observations on the international application <p>3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.</p> <p>When? See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension. See rule 66.2(d).</p> <p>How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.</p> <p>Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4. For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 bis. For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6</p> <p>If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.</p> <p>4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: <u>23 April 2005 (23.04.2005)</u>.</p>

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: IPEA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230	Authorized officer Geoffrey L. Knable Telephone No. 703-308-0651	<i>Jean Proctor Paralegal Specialist</i>
---	--	--

Form PCT/IPEA/408 (cover sheet)(July 1998)

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To:
GREGORY N. CLEMENTS
DOUGHERTY CLEMENTS, HOFER & BERNARD
1901 ROXBOROUGH ROAD, SUITE 300
CHARLOTTE, NC 28211

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

Date of Mailing (day/month/year)	03 DEC 2004
-------------------------------------	--------------------

Applicant's or agent's file reference 2003-13-PCT		REPLY DUE within 2 months/days from the above date of mailing
International application No. PCT/US03/40872	International filing date (day/month/year) 22 December 2003 (22.12.2003)	Priority date (day/month/year) 23 December 2002 (23.12.2002)
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC(7): C08J 5/06 and US Cl.: 156/335, 910; 152/565; 428/296.4		
Applicant INVISTA TECHNOLOGIES S.A RL.		

1. This written opinion is the first (first, etc.) drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.
2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:
 - I Basis of the opinion
 - II Priority
 - III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
 - IV Lack of unity of invention
 - V Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2 (a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
 - VI Certain documents cited
 - VII Certain defects in the international application
 - VIII Certain observations on the international application
3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.

When? See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension. See rule 66.2(d).

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4. For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 bis. For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.
4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 23 April 2005 (23.04.2005).

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: IPEA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230	Authorized officer Geoffrey L. Knable Telephone No. 703-308-0651	Jean Proctor Paralegal Spec 
---	--	---

Form PCT/IPEA/408 (cover sheet)(July 1998)

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/US03/40872

I. Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the elements of the international application:*

 the international application as originally filed the description:pages 1-46, as originally filedpages NONE, filed with the demandpages NONE, filed with the letter of _____ the claims:pages 47-61, as originally filedpages NONE, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19pages NONE, filed with the demandpages NONE, filed with the letter of _____ the drawings:pages NONE, as originally filedpages NONE, filed with the demandpages NONE, filed with the letter of _____ the sequence listing part of the description:pages NONE, as originally filedpages NONE, filed with the demandpages NONE, filed with the letter of _____

2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is:

 the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)). the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)). the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the written opinion was drawn on the basis of the sequence listing:

 contained in the international application in printed form. filed together with the international application in computer readable form. furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form. furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form. The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished. The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.4. The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of: the description, pages NONE the claims, Nos. NONE the drawings, sheets/fig NONE5. This opinion has been drawn as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed."

WRITTEN OPINIONInternational application No.
PCT/US03/40872**V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement****1. STATEMENT**

Novelty (N)	Claims <u>NONE</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-70</u>	NO
Inventive Step (IS)	Claims <u>NONE</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-70</u>	NO
Industrial Applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1-70</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO

2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

Claims 1-70 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) and inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being anticipated by AITKEN (US 3,318,750). AITKEN discloses reinforced rubber articles and methods for their formation in which polyester fibrous materials including cords are precoated with a water-based composition that includes resorcinol, formaldehyde and a triallyl cyanurate ("component 1") as well as rubber latex (in "component 2"), the coating being fixed to the cord under heat (col. 3, lines 69-71). The coated fibers/cords are then embedded in rubber, which is then cured (col. 4, lines 7-14). Further, the patent suggests relative molar amounts of resorcinol and formaldehyde (col. 2, lines 1-8) as well as the percent latex solids (col. 2, lines 40-41) and coating weights (col. 3, lines 61-68) consistent with those claimed. AITKEN is therefore considered to anticipate the claimed method/composition/material/article.

Claims 1-14, 18-28, 32-44, 48-62 and 66-70 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) and inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being anticipated by RYE et al. (US 3,226,276). RYE et al. discloses reinforced rubber articles and methods for their formation in which polyester fibrous materials including cords are precoated with a water-based composition that includes resorcinol and formaldehyde as well as rubber latex (e.g. claim 1 of the patent), the coating being fixed to the cord under heat (e.g. col. 4, lines 11-14). The coated fibers/cords are then embedded in rubber, which is then cured. Further, the patent suggests relative molar amounts of resorcinol and formaldehyde (col. 3, lines 1-26) as well as the percent latex solids (e.g. col. 4, line 60) consistent with those claimed. AITKEN is therefore considered to anticipate the claimed method/composition/material/article.

Claims 1-70 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.

----- NEW CITATIONS -----

US 3,226,276 A (RYE et al.) 28 December 1965 (28.12.1965), col. 3, lines 1-26.

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.
PCT/US03/40872

Supplemental Box
(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

TIME LIMIT:

The time limit set for response to a Written Opinion may not be extended. 37 CFR 1.484(d). Any response received after the expiration of the time limit set in the Written Opinion will not be considered in preparing the International Preliminary Examination Report.